



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

SAB

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	INVENTOR NAME	CLASS	CLASSIFICATION
08/702,625	08/23/96	KLUDE	H	H0215/1556PC

12M1/1216

JOHN DANIEL WOOD  
HENKEL CORPORATION  
140 GERMANTOWN PIKE  
SUITE 150  
PLYMOUTH MEETING PA 19462

EXAMINER	
COONEY, J	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1207	9
DATE MAILED: 12/16/97	

Below is a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

### ADVISORY ACTION

☒ THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE:

a) ☒ is extended to run \_\_\_\_\_ or continues to run 3 months from the date of the final rejection

b) ☐ expires three months from the date of the final rejection or as of the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

☐ Appellant's Brief is due in accordance with 37 CFR 1.192(a).

☒ Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed 11/17/97 has been considered with the following effect, but it is not deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:

1. ☐ The proposed amendments to the claim and/or specification will not be entered and the final rejection stands because:

- ☐ There is no convincing showing under 37 CFR 1.116(b) why the proposed amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented.
- ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See Note).
- ☐ They raise the issue of new matter. (See Note).
- ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
- ☐ They present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE:

2. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claims \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowed if submitted in a separately filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.

3. ☐ Upon the filing an appeal, the proposed amendment ☐ will be entered ☐ will not be entered and the status of the claims will be as follows:

Claims allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claims objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claims rejected: \_\_\_\_\_

However;

☐ Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_

4. ☐ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does not overcome the rejection because nothing unexpected is attributed to applicants' use of blowing agents or dispersion  
their materials from pressurized vessels. Markush shows control of NCO contents,  
and nothing is seen to be attributable to applicants' use of content values.  
NCO content values are easily controlled by factors such as by decreasing or  
increasing the molecular weight of the polymeric backbone. Applicants' inventive  
step appears to reside in the dispensing of isocyanate materials having low  
free isocyanate monomer contents to utilize their inherent low toxicity. This is known to  
the prior art.  
Line 12 of page 2 of the previous Office action  
inadvertently refers to rejection under 35 USC 102 as well  
as 35 USC 103. This was a typographical mistake,  
and the Office action as a whole clearly maintains  
the rejection only under 35 USC 103.

JOHN M. COONEY JR.  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 1200